

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of December 13, 2007 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. However, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

The claims were rejected based upon new grounds of rejection noted at page 7 of the Office Action. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 11, 12, 14-17, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the newly-cited reference, U.S. Patent 7,020,696 to Perry, et al. (hereinafter Perry). Claims 10 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perry in view of Microsoft Computer Dictionary. Claims 8, 9, 18, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perry.

Although Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejections, Applicant nevertheless has amended certain claims so as to expedite prosecution of the application. Applicant respectfully notes, however, that the amendments are not intended as, and should not be interpreted as, the surrender of any subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully reserves the right to present the original version of any of the amended claims in any future divisional or continuation applications from the present application.

In particular, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 11, and 21 to further emphasize certain aspects of the invention. Applicant also has amended dependent Claims 4 and 14 so as to maintain consistency among the claims and to emphasize certain other aspects. The claim amendments, as discussed herein, are fully supported throughout the Specification. No new matter has been introduced by virtue of any of the claim amendments.

Certain Aspects Of Applicant's Invention

It may be useful to reiterate certain aspects of the invention prior to addressing the new grounds of rejection. One embodiment, typified by Claim 1, is a method for

presenting system services.

The method can include categorizing the system services by functional groups. (See, e.g., Specification, paragraph [0029], lines 7-12.) Accordingly, the method further can include displaying at least a portion of the system services within a graphical user interface according to the categories. (See, e.g., Specification, paragraphs [0030]-[0032].)

The method also can include establishing a plurality of system service profiles, detecting a request for the presentation of system services, ascertaining a server identity that provides the system services, and determining one of the system service profiles associated with the request. The determining can be based at least in part upon the ascertained server identity. Additionally, the method can include listing at least one system service in accordance with a system service profile.

The Claims Define Over The References

As already noted independent Claims 1, 11, and 21 were each rejected as being anticipated by Perry. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that Perry fails to teach or suggest every feature recited in Claims 1, 11, and 21, as amended.

For example, Perry fails to teach or suggest categorizing system services. Indeed, Perry nowhere even mentions categories of any relevant kind. Perry specifically fails to teach or suggest categorizing system services by functional groups.

In a portion of the reference cited, Perry discloses a "navigation tree." The navigation tree, however, does not relate in any manner to functional groups of system services. Instead, Perry's navigation tree pertains only particular *devices*.

Referring to FIG. 4a, the NMS client displays a graphical user interface (GUI) 895 to the administrator including a navigation tree/menu 898.

Selecting a branch of the navigation tree causes the NMS client to display

information corresponding to that branch. For example, selecting Devices branch 898a within the tree causes the NMS client to display a list 898b of IP addresses and/or domain name server (DNS) names corresponding to network devices that may be managed by the administrator. The list corresponds to a profile associated with the administrator's user name and password. (Perry, Col. 18, line 64 – Col. 19, line 5.)

The navigation tree thus corresponds to specific hardware devices. Hardware devices, however, are not comparable to system services. Perry, accordingly, does not provide any categorization, but more fundamentally, Perry nowhere teaches or suggests a categorization of different system services based on or according to function. It follows that Perry does not teach or suggest categorizing system services by functional groups, as explicitly recited in amended Claims 1, 11, and 21.

It further follows that where as Perry fails to disclose categorizing system services by functional groups, Perry is incapable of generating any kind of display based upon such categorization. Specifically, Perry further fails to teach or suggest displaying at least a portion of the system services within a graphical user interface according to these categories by functional groups.

Accordingly, Perry fails to teach or even suggest every feature recited in amended Claims 1, 11, and 21. Applicant respectfully submits, therefore, that Claims 1, 11, and 21 each define over the prior art. Applicant further respectfully submits that, whereas each of the remaining claims depends from Claim 1, 11, or 21 while reciting additional features, each of the dependent claims likewise defines over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicant requests that the Examiner call the

Appln No. 10/688,406
Amendment dated March 13, 2008
Reply to Office Action of December 13, 2007
Docket No. BOC9-2003-0034 (403)

undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

AKERMAN SENTERFITT

Date: March 13, 2008



Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652
Customer No. 40987
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000